NOT TO BE TAKEN
FROM THE LIBRARY

Mabelle Bennett

Boston University
College of Liberal Arts
Library

THE GIFT OF the author

July, 1929

378.744
BO
AM 1928
ben
copy 1

Ideal
Double Reversible
Mauscript Cover
PATENTED NOV. 15, 1898
Manufactured by
Adams, Cushing & Foster

28-6½

37481

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Thesis

# The
# Trial of Jesus According to Luke

Submitted by

Mabelle French Bennett

(B.A., University of Washington, 1923)

In Partial fulfillment of requirements for

the degree of Master of Arts

1928

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

Jesus Christ - Trial
Scenes

July 1929

37481

upstairs
378.744
BO
AM 1928
ben
copy 1

# THE TRIAL OF JESUS ACCORDING TO LUKE

## Outline.

Page

I. Introduction . . . . . 1

II. Exhibit of the Triple Parallel Accounts 5

III. Detailed Comparison of the Narratives . 25

Introduction. . . . . 25

A. Jesus Brought to the Sanhedrin . . 26

B. The Civil Trial. . . . . 39

C. Jesus Before Herod . . . . . 48

D. Back to Pilate . . . . . 51

E. Summary . . . . . 61

IV. Theories Developed in Recent Source Criticism

Introduction. . . . . 65

A. Theory by Dr. J. Vernon Bartlet. . 67

B. Theory by Dr. W. Sanday. . . . . 72

C. Canon B. H. Streeter . . . . . 74

D. Alfred M. Perry. . . . . 82

E. Dr. Burton Scott Easton. . . . . 86

F. Dr. Vincent Taylor . . . . . 88

V. The Proto-Luke Hypothesis. . . . . 95
A. Reasons for the Hypothesis . . . . 95
1. Use of Markan Source. . . . . 95
2. The Passion Narrative . . . . 98
3. The Markan Omissions. . . . . 99
4. Use of Q Material . . . . . 100
B. Proto-Luke a Complete Gospel. . . . 101
1. Opinions Regarding non-
Markan matter. . . . . 101
2. Why a Single Source . . . . . 103
a. Unity of non-Markan
Sections. . . . . 103
b. Q an expanded form. . . 103
c. Material not in Passion
Narrative . . . . . 104
d. Coherent Narrative. . . 104
e. Deficiencies supplied
by Markan sections. . . 104
f. The Passion narrative . 105
g. Summary . . . . . 106

VI. Summary . . . . . 107

## Introduction.

More and more are men becoming concerned with the reconstruction of the actual life and events as well as the words of the man who has effected the world's history for nearly two thousand years. People are spending more time analyzing and imagining the life of the Master Teacher. In all studies of the life of Jesus we must remember that our sources of information are limited to few accounts, and particularly to the synoptic gospels--Matthew, Mark and Luke. In trying to unearth the exact truth from these three we encounter difficulties that necessitate time and detailed analysis. We find that the stories which these men tell do not always agree. They harmonize in the spirit and the larger issues, but in many details the accounts differ. We realize that these men were not statisticians or court reporters who would record the facts with mathematical accuracy, but rather they were enthusiastic followers of the Master who became so impressed by His deeds, words, personality and the events which they called forth that they wished to write the story as it appeared to them.

No one account claims to be complete or give a life history of Jesus. As we read their records we

recognize that the authors were plain people, human, fallible, and handicapped by the same personal limitations that hinder us today from having perfect productions. They were impressed and reacted according to their own natures. Just as people today are different in environment, inheritance, and education, so were these men. Their writings are therefore natural reactions which we must view accordingly. In order to understand each gospel, one must study the individual author, his race, family, individual tendencies, his social and religious background, and how the events reacted on him.

Matthew was a Jew and being so was looking for the coming of the Messiah. He was of a religious nature, scholarly, a lover of the scriptures. He saw in Jesus the fulfillment of the Messianic hope as portrayed in the prophets.

Mark was probably the youngest of any of the evangelists. His gospel indicates close companionship with Peter--the impetuous, spontaneous, enthusiastic admirer of Jesus. He wrote for the Romans and his work is substantially the preaching of Peter at Rome. The gospel for Mark must represent Jesus in His character and career,

from the Roman point of view, as answering to the idea of Divine power, work, law, conquest and universal sway. He presents Christianity as a battle-call of the Almighty Conqueror.

Luke, on the other hand, was a Greek, having no hope in a Messiah, and therefore saw in the Man of Galilee a great personality of different significance. His gospel has its basis in the gospel which Paul and Luke, by long preaching to the Greeks, had already thrown into the form best suited to commend their acceptance of Jesus as the Divine man. It is the gospel of the future, of progressive Christianity, of reason and culture seeking the perfection of manhood.

In this thesis we are especially interested in the accounts of the trial of Jesus as recorded by these synoptic writers in Matthew 26:57 - 27:26, Mark 14:53 - 15:15 and Luke 22:54 - 23:25. However, within these limits there is some material which we are omitting in this discussion of the trial accounts, - The fate of Judas, found in Matthew 27:3-10 and Peter's denial recorded in Matthew 26:69-75, Mark 14:66-72 and Luke 22:56-62.

In comparing the three accounts of the trial

we find that there are differences both in wording and in context. Such differences give rise to such questions as, which account was first? Where did each writer get his material? Which is the most trustworthy? Did the authors have common sources which they used? Was there some source which one or two of the authors did not have? Was the gospel of Mark St. Luke's source? How account for the material peculiar to Luke? Was this derived from a principal or secondary source?

In order to solve these problems the narratives will be compared and contrasted to show their similarities and differences from which we hope to arrive at conclusions concerning the reason for the departures. We shall present an exhibit showing a triple comparison of the trial narratives, comparing first Matthew and Mark, and then Mark and Luke, marking the departures in each. Then we shall discuss the sections making comparisons verse by verse .

During the last few years New Testament scholars have made very decided strides in the theories propounded regarding the sources of the gospels, and especially Luke. Each theory seems to be an outgrowth and improvement on a preceding one, until at the present time a more satisfactory hypothesis of Luke's sources is available which will be discussed in this paper.

## II. An Exhibit of the Triple Parallel Accounts.

In order to compare readily the three gospel accounts of the trial of Jesus, we shall place them in columns with the parallel groups of words opposite each other insofar as possible. Mark is placed in the center so that the comparison may be made with Matthew first, and then with Luke.

Additions to the Markan account by Matthew are underlined in black: for instance, in the first verse of the trial account, Matthew names the high priest, Caiaphas, while Mark just writes, 'high priest'. Therefore, 'Caiaphas' is underlined, for it is an addition to the Markan account.

Sections in Mark which are omitted by Matthew are underlined in red. In Mark 14:53 Mark speaks of the 'chief priests and the elders and the scribes' as meeting together, while Matthew only mentioned the elders. In this case Mark's version is underlined in red as it is omitted by Matthew.

In comparing the narratives by Mark and Luke, the sections in Mark which have no Lukan parallel are underlined in green. For instance, Mark 14:55-61b covering the account of the false witnesses brought against

Jesus is not found in Luke and so is underlined in green.

The sections in Luke which are not found in Mark or differences in the accounts are underlined in blue. Luke's account of Jesus' answer to the chief priests is different from that given by Mark and therefore is underlined in blue.

In several cases Mark's account is underlined in both red and green, showing that Matthew has omitted that section and that it is not found in Luke.

# THE TRIAL OF JESUS

## A. Before the Sanhedrin

Matt. 26:57

And they that had taken Jesus led him away to the house of Caiaphas, the high priest, where the elders were gathered together.

Mark 14:53

And they led Jesus away to the high priest: and there come together with him all the chief priests and the elders and the scribes.

Luke 22:54

And they seized him, and led him away, and brought him into the high priest's house.

Matt. 26:58

But Peter followed him afar off unto the court of the high priest, and entered in, and sat with the officers, to see the end.

Mark 14:54

And Peter had followed him afar off even within, into the court of the high priest: and he was sitting with the officers, and warming himself in the light of the fire.

Luke 22:54a,55.

But Peter followed afar off. And when they had kindled a fire in the midst of the court, and had sat down together, Peter sat in the midst of them.

Matt. 26:59

Now the chief priest and the whole council

Mark 14:55

Now the chief priests and the whole council

sought false witness against Jesus, that they might put him to death:

Matt.26:60,61

And they found it not, though many false witnesses came.

But afterward came two, and said,
This man said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days.

Matt.26:62,63.

And the high priest stood up, and said unto him, Ans-

sought witness against Jesus to put him to death:

Mark 14:55a-59

And found it not.
For many bare false witness against him, and their witness agreed not together.
And there stood up certain, and bare false witness against him, saying, We heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another made without hands.
And not even so did their witness agree together.

Mark 14:60,61

And the high priest stood up in the midst, and asked Jesus saying, Ans-

werest thou nothing? what is it which these witness against thee? But Jesus held his peace.

Matt. 26:63b

And the high priest said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou art the Christ, the Son of God.

werest thou nothing? what is it which these witness against thee? But he held his peace, and answered nothing.

Mark 14:61b

And the high priest asked him,

and

saith unto him, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?

Luke 22:66,67a.

And as soon as it was day, the assembly of the elders of the people was gathered together, both chief priests and scribes; and they led him away into their council saying, If thou art the Christ, tell us.

Matt. 26:64
Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you,

Mark 14:62
And Jesus said, I am:

Luke 22:67b,68.
But he said unto them, If I tell you, ye will not believe: and if I ask you, ye will not answer.

Matt. 26:64b
Henceforth ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of Heaven.

Mark 14:62b
And ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven.

Luke 22:69
But from henceforth shall the Son of man be seated at the right hand of the power of God.

Luke 22:70
And they all said, Art thou then the Son of God? And he said unto them, Ye say that I am.

Matt.26:65,66.
Then the high priest rent his garments,

Mark 14:63,64.
And the high priest rent his clothes,

saying, He hath spoken blasphemy: what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard the blasphemy: what think ye? They answered, He is worthy of death.

and saith, what further need have we of witnesses? Ye have heard the blasphemy: what think ye? And they all condemned him to be worthy of death.

And they said, what further need have we of witness? for we ourselves have heard from his own mouth.

Matt.26:67,68

Then did they spit in his face and buffet him: and some smote him with the palms of their hands, saying, Prophesy unto us, thou Christ: who is he that struck thee?

Mark 14:65

And some began to spit on him, and to cover his face, and to buffet him, and to say unto him, Prophesy: and the officers received him with blows of their hands.

Luke 22:63-65

And the men that held Jesus mocked him, and beat him. And they blindfolded him, and asked him saying, Prophesy: who is he that struck thee? And many other things spake they against him, reviling him.

## B. Christ Before Pilate.

Matt.27:1,2.

Now when morning was come, all the chief priests and the elders of the people took counsel against Jesus to put him to death: and they bound him, and led him away, and delivered him up to Pilate, the governor.

Mark 15:1

And straightway in the morning, the chief priests and the elders and the scribes, and the whole council, held a consultation, and bound Jesus, and carried him away, and delivered him up to Pilate.

Luke 23:1

And the whole company of them rose up, and brought him before Pilate.

Luke 23:2

And they began to accuse him, saying, We found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, and saying that he himself is Christ, a king.

| Matt.27:11 | Mark 15:2 | Luke 23:3 |
|---|---|---|
| Now Jesus stood before the governor: and the governor asked him saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And Jesus said unto him, Thou sayest. | And Pilate asked him, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answering saith unto him, Thou sayest. | And Pilate asked him saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answered him and said, Thou sayest. |

| Matt.27:12-14 | Mark 15:3-5 |
|---|---|
| And when he was accused by the chief priests and elders, he answered nothing. | And the chief priests accused him of many things. |
| Then Pilate saith unto him, Hearest thou not how many things they witness against thee? And he gave no answer, | And Pilate again asked him, saying, Answerest thou nothing, behold how many things they accuse thee of. But Jesus no more answered. |

not even to one word: insomuch that the governor marvelled greatly.

anything, insomuch that Pilate marvelled.

Luke 23:4,5.

And Pilate said unto the chief priests and the multitudes, I find no fault in this man. But they were the more urgent, saying, He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Judea, and beginning from Galilee even unto this place.

Luke 23:6,7.

But when Pilate heard it, he asked whether the man were a Galilean. And when he knew that he was of Herod's jurisdiction, he sent him unto Herod, who himself also was at Jerusalem in these days.

Luke 23:8

Now when Herod saw Jesus, he was exceeding glad: for he was of a long time desirous to see him, because he had heard concerning him; and he hoped to see some miracle done by him.

Luke 23:9

And he questioned him in many words: but he answered him nothing.

Luke 23:10

And the chief priests and the scribes stood, vehemently accusing him.

Luke 23:11

And Herod with his soldiers set him at nought, and mocked him, and arraying him in gorgeous apparel sent him back to Pilate.

Luke 23:12

And Herod and Pilate became friends with each other that very day: for before they were at enmity between themselves.

Matt.27:15,16

Now at the feast the governor was wont to release unto the multitude one prisoner, whom they would. And they then had a notable prisoner, called Barabbas.

Mark 15:6-8

Now at the feast he used to release unto them one prisoner, whom they asked of him. And there was one called Barabbas, lying bound with them that had made insurrection, men who in the insurrection had committed murder. And the multitude went up and began to ask him to do as he was wont to do unto them.

Luke 23:17

(For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.)

Matt.27:17

When therefore they were gathered together, Pilate said unto them, Whom will ye that I release unto you? Barabbas or Jesus, who is called Christ?

Mark 15:9

And Pilate answered them saying, Will ye that I release unto you the King of the Jews?

Matt.27:18

For he knew that for envy they had delivered him up.

Mark 15:10

For he perceived that for envy the chief priests had delivered him up.

Matt. 27:19

And while he was sitting on the judgment seat, his wife sent unto him, saying, Have thou nothing to do with that righteous man; for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him.

Matt.27:20

Now the chief priests and the elders persuaded the multitudes that they should ask for Barabbas, and destroy Jesus.

Mark 15:11

But the chief priests stirred up the multitude, that he should rather release Barabbas unto them.

Luke 23:18,19.

But they cried out all together, Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas: one who for a certain insurrection made in the city, and for murder was cast into prison.

Matt. 27:21

But the governor answered and said unto them, Which of the two will ye that I release unto you? And they said, Barabbas.

| Matt. 27:23,23 | Mark 15:12-14 | Luke 23:20-22 |
|---|---|---|
| | And Pilate | And Pilate spake |
| Pilate saith unto them, What shall I do unto Jesus who is called Christ? | answered and said unto them, What then shall I do unto him whom ye call the King of the Jews? | unto them again, desiring to release Jesus: but |
| They all say, Let him be crucified. | And they cried out again, Crucify him. | they shouted, saying, Crucify him. |
| And he said, Why, what evil hath he done? | And Pilate said unto them, Why, what evil hath he done? | And he said unto them a third time, Why, what evil hath this man done? I have found no cause of death in him: I will therefore chastise him and release him. |
| But they cried out exceedingly, saying, Let him be crucified. | But they cried out exceedingly, Crucify him. | But they were urgent with loud voices, asking that he might be crucified. And their voices prevailed. |

Matt. 27:24,25.

So when Pilate saw
that he prevailed
nothing, but rather
that a tumult was
arising, he took
water, and washed
his hands before
the multitude, saying,
I am innocent of
the blood of this
righteous man; see
ye to it.

And all the people
answered and said,
His blood be on us,
and on our children.

| Matt.27:26 | Mark 15:15 | Luke 23:24,25. |
|---|---|---|
| Then | And Pilate, wishing to content the multitude, released unto them Barabbas, | And Pilate gave sentence that what they asked for should be done. And he released him that for insurrec- |
| released he unto them Barabbas, | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | tion and murder |
| | | had been cast into |
| | | prison, whom they |
| | and | asked for: but |
| but Jesus | delivered Jesus, | Jesus he delivered |
| he scourged | when he had | up to their will. |
| and delivered | scourged him, to | |
| to be crucified. | be crucified. | |

## III. Detailed Comparison of the Narratives.

In the preceding exhibit of the triple parallel narratives we found many differences. In some cases the departures are in words, arrangement, or context, but in others several verses are added or omitted.

The most important difference is in the time of the trial. Both Mark and Matthew say that when morning came Jesus was delivered to Pilate. This would mean that Jesus had been tried before the Sanhedrin at night. However, Luke writes, 'As soon as it was day, the assembly of the elders of the people.....led him away into their council.' If this were true, Jesus was kept a prisoner all night by the priests before being brought before the Sanhedrin.

Another difference in the accounts is in the mocking to which Jesus was subjected. Mark and Matthew place the mocking after the trial and before Jesus was taken to Pilate. In this case the ill treatment would have been by those present in the court of the Sanhedrin. Luke, on the other hand, speaks of the "men who held Jesus", those who had arrested Jesus, and the

mocking precedes the trial. He also speaks of Herod's soldiers mocking Jesus.

In Mark there is an account of the false witnesses and destroying the temple in three days and rebuilding it. Luke does not mention this part.

There is a difference in Jesus' answer to the high priest. In Mark it is just "I am", while in Luke, "If I tell you, ye will not believe; and if I ask you, ye will not answer." Another slight difference is in in the rest of the verse. Mark writes, "Ye shall see the Son of Man...." and Luke, "But from henceforth shall the Son of Man be seated at the right hand of the power of God." He does not add "And coming with the clouds of heaven", as Mark and Matthew do.

In Mark 14:63 there is a statement, that the "high priest" rent his clothes". But Luke has no parallel to this.

There is a wide departure in Luke 23:2. A three-folk charge is preferred against Jesus before Pilate asks him if he is King of the Jews. This seems more logical than Mark's version in which Pilate asks the question immediately.

Luke is the only one who records an account

of the trial before Herod. Mark and Matthew do not even mention that Jesus appeared before Herod.

In the latter part of the trial especially Luke tries to show Pilate's innocence, for he writes that "Pilate spake unto them again, desirous to release Jesus". Then he said unto them a third time that he found no cause for death in Him. Luke emphasizes that the crowd was urgent, and that "Pilate gave sentence that what they asked for should be done". But Mark writes, "Pilate, wishing to content the multitude, released Barabbas".

The differences between Mark and Luke are so numerous that it is evident Luke must have had some source other than Mark's gospel. The question arises, did St. Luke use Mark as his main source and have some other secondary source which includes the material not found in Mark, or was the other source the primary one to which he subsequently added the Markan material?

In order to lay the foundation for the solution of this problem we shall now compare the accounts verse by verse giving a little of the back-

ground and circumstances of the different steps in the trial and critically examine the literary relation which exists between the Markan and the Lukan accounts of the trial.

The trial narrative naturally falls into four sections: (s) Jesus brought to the Sanhedrin; (b) The civil trial before the Heathen procurator; (c) Jesus before Herod; and (d) Jesus again before Pilate. At the end of the section we shall make tentative conclusions regarding the source material.

A. Jesus Before Sanhedrin

Jesus was led from the Garden of Gethsemane on the Mount of Olives to be tried before the Sanhedrin. At this time Joseph Caiaphas was the high priest and by virtue of his office, president of the Council. Annas, the father-in-law of Caiaphas, had held the high priesthood from 6 to 16 A. D., but had been deposed by the Roman governor, Gratus. Although he was merely high priest emeritus he retained his prestige, and was still called the high priest.

We find that Mark and Matthew differ somewhat in the first part of the account, although this is a minor difference and does not show that Mark was not Matthew's source.

| Mark 14: 53 | Matthew 26: 57 |
|---|---|
| "And they led Jesus away to the high priest: and there come together with him all the chief priests and the elders and the scribes." | "And they that had taken Jesus led him away to the house of Caiaphas, the high priest, where the scribes and the elders were gathered together." |

Kent writes: "The author of Matthew, recalling the fact that Caiaphas was the ruling high priest, states that Jesus was examined at his house."[1] Luke does not give

(1) Kent, C. F.: Life and Teachings of Jesus, p. 283.

the name of the high priest:

Luke 22: 54.

"And they seized him, and led
him away, and brought him into
the high priest's house."

Although these three accounts are slightly different in wording, the context is the same.

The next verses show a very well-known difference in the three trial accounts--the time of the trial.

Mark 15:1

"And straightway in the morning the chief priests with the elders...delivered him up to Pilate."

Matt. 27:1, 2

"Now when morning was come, all the chief priests and the elders..... delivered him up to Pilate."

According to these accounts, Jesus must have been tried before the Sanhedrin at night just after His arrest for he was taken to Pilate in the morning. This would mean that there was a midnight session of the Council. "The unconstitutionality of such procedure, if not its absolute impossibility has long been recognized."[1] The practice of the Sanhedrin, according to the Mishna, was to convene during the day. Only then were its decisions valid. It would seem rather difficult to have many or even the quorum of twenty-three members present for a trial in the

(1) Kent; C. F.: Life and Teachings of Jesus, p. 283.

middle of the night. Even though they might rush through such a trial, they would gain nothing, for they would have to wait until morning to take Jesus to Pilate. Perhaps Caiaphas, Annas, and some others were there when He was brought from Gethsemane. We find Luke's account the most logical.

Luke 22:66

"And as soon as it was day,
the assembly of the elders of
the people.....led him away
into their council."

The probability is the council was not formally convened until the early morning, perhaps about six a.m. and that Jesus was in custody during the night. Easton writes, "That the Sanhedrin is really implied is indubitable for there was no other 'assembly' with judicial powers."[1]

We wonder how Jesus was being treated during the interim at the high priest's house, if the trial occurred in the morning. Mark and Matthew place the mocking after the trial before the Sanhedrin which would be necessary if the trial took place immediately after the arrest.

Mark 14:65

"And some began to spit on him, and to cover his face and to buffet him, and to say unto him,

Matthew 26:67, 68.

"Then did they spit in his face and buffet him: and some smote him with the palms of their hands, saying,

(1) Easton, B.S.: The Gospel Acc. toLuke,p.356

Prophesy: and the officers received him with blows of their hands."

Prophesy unto us, thou Christ: who is he that struck thee?

It seems that the men who insulted Him are present in the court and are distinguished from the officers. In Luke the mocking precedes the trial and the mockers were apparently those who had arrested Jesus.

Luke 22:63-65

"And the men that held Jesus
mocked him, and beat him.
And they blindfolded him, and
asked him, saying, Prophesy:
who is he that struck thee?
And many other things spake
they against him, reviling him."

Luke refers to beating rather than buffeting, and does not mention spitting. Streeter contends that the original Markan text lacked the words 'and to cover his face'. Then the reference to blindfolding is peculiar to Luke with the result that the two versions are entirely different. In the Markan account, the mockers spit on Him, slap Him, and cry, "Prophesy". In Luke they veil His eyes, strike Him and say, "Use your prophetic gift of second sight to tell

the striker's name. Each picture is consistent. One verse is added which is not mentioned in Mark, "And many other things spake they against him reviling him". "In this story, if anywhere, Luke is following a tradition which owes nothing whatever to Mark."[1]

In verse sixty-three an interesting point arises. The verse begins, according to the Revised Version, with 'And the men that held Jesus'. Taylor says this is not a translation as the margin indicates, for in the Greek there is no word for "Jesus", and just the pronoun "him" is used. This version gives the sense of the pronoun and it is necessary in view of the story of Peter. "But why has Luke "him" and not "Jesus"? If the denial is a later insertion, the reason is plain. In the non-Markan source the word "Jesus" was not necessary, since Luke 22:63 followed immediately after Luke 22:54a. The entire passage read as follows: 'And they seized him, and led him away, and brought him into the high priest's house. And the men that held him mocked him, and beat him. And they blindfolded him, and asked him, saying, Prophesy: who is he that struck thee? And many other things spake they

(1) Taylor, V.: Behind the Third Gospel, p.49.

against him, reviling him.' The reiterated "him" is surely intentional. Here we have undoubtedly a dramatic passage which the subsequent insertion of the Mark story of the Denial has veiled."[1]

The next verses give an account of Jesus' trial before the Sanhedrin.

| Mark 14: 55, 56. | Matthew 26:59, 60. |
|---|---|
| "Now the chief priests and the whole council sought witness against Jesus to put him to death; and found it not. For many bare false witness against him, and their witness agreed not together." | "Now the chief priests and the whole council sought false witness against Jesus, that they might put him to death; and they found it not, though many false witnesses came." |

There is no parallel in the Lukan account for these verses regarding the witnesses. It is plain that Matthew is dependent upon Mark. Each one mentions 'false witness', and that the priests were trying to put Jesus to death. In their minds he was already condemned, and they just needed to convince Pilate that he should be killed. Then some false witnesses came with what at first appeared to be relevant testimony.

(1) Taylor: Behind the Third Gospel, p. 50

| Mark 14:57 | Matthew 26:61 |
| --- | --- |
| "And there stood up certain, and bare false witness against him saying, We heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another made without hands. And not even so did their witnesses agree together. | "But afterward came two, and said, This man said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days. |

Matthew departs somewhat in these verses. He is silent on the disagreement of the witnesses, and does not state that these two were false. It is hard to say where this saying originated about Jesus destroying the temple, since it is not recorded in the synoptics among the sayings of Jesus. If such a statement had ~~not~~ been made, surely the synoptic writers would have included it in the account of the cleansing of the Temple. Needless to say, the persecutors took this saying literally. "The popular <u>animus</u> needed but a few days to distort an enigmatic saying of this kind. Many versions

of it would be afloat on the bubbling tide of gossip in the Jerusalem streets, and some of these were uttered by hostile lips to hostile ears before the Council."[1] The first charge against Jesus, then, according to Mark, is regarding the temple--blasphemy. However, such a charge would have little weight with Pilate. If they could prove that He proclaimed Himself to be the Messiah, then Pilate might recognize Him as dangerous and think He should be put to death.

Matthew and Mark agree that Jesus refused to answer the temple charge and remained silent.

Mark 14:60,61a.

"And the high priest stood up in the midst, and asked Jesus saying, Answerest thou nothing? What is it which these witness against thee? But he held his peace, and answered nothing."

Matthew 26:62,63a.

"And the high priest stood up, and said unto him, Answerest thou nothing? What is it which these witness against thee? But Jesus held his peace."

The high priest challenged Jesus and tried to make Him incriminate Himself. No prisoner had ever stood before him without making some defense, and he was baffled by Jesus' silence. It may have been that

(1) Hastings: Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, Vol. II, p.752.

some in the Council did not favor the plans of Caiaphas and Annas. Perhaps the failure to attack Jesus for cleansing the temple may indicate that several members rather approved of the act; and "it was a matter of moment to bring the whole Council into line against Jesus, to rouse every interest, sacerdotal and official, in order that a unanimous verdict might be carried to Pilate."[1] It is rather singular that no other charge is made by the witnesses than the one regarding the destruction and rebuilding of the temple. If any other charge were made, it surely would have been mentioned in this connection. But the high priest made his own charge without having the witness speak further.

Mark 14:61b

"Again the high priest asked him, and saith unto him, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?"

Matthew 26:63b

"And the high priest said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou art the Christ, the Son of God."

This was the important question upon which they

(1) Hastings: Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, Vol. II, p. 753.

could condemn Jesus. It was a categorical and crucial query. Jesus could not and would not evade the matters now brought to an issue. Mark's addition, "Son of the Blessed", is perhaps more original than Matthew's generalized "Son of God". Luke's account gives this question as the first put to Jesus and the vital one.

Luke 22:66,67a.

"And as soon as it was day, the assembly of the elders of the people was gathered together, both chief priests and scribes; and they led him away into their council, saying, If thou art the Christ, tell us."

Each gospel records a different answer by Jesus.

Mark 14:62.

"And Jesus said, I am".

Matthew 26:64

"Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you...."

This was a formula of assent. But it seems that such would be misleading. He was not the kind of Messiah they were looking for, yet to say that he was not the

Messiah would be untrue. Luke's version seems the most likely answer.

Luke 22:67b,68.

"But he said unto them, If I tell you, ye will not believe: and if I ask you, ye will not answer."

This reply shows Jesus' tact, and brings to mind the cautious answers to his persecutors at previous times. His words reveal the dilemma which confronted him. The three accounts of the rest of Jesus' answer are very similar.

Mark 14:62b

"And ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven."

Matthew 26:64b

"Henceforth ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven."

Matthew again has taken verbatim Mark's account. Luke

gives a passage which is much less objective than its Markan counterpart:

> "But from henceforth shall
> the Son of Man be seated at
> the right hand of the Power
> of God." (Lk. 22:69.)

Mark says, "Ye shall see", referring to the priests and scribes, while Luke simply states the fact of the session and has nothing corresponding to"And coming on the clouds of heaven." Again, in Luke it is the "power of God" instead of "power". "The passage could be regarded as an editorial adaptation of Mark. But closer study tends to show that its form is due less to the editorial use of Mark than to the drift of the Lukan story as a whole."[1]

Jesus' answer, "If I tell you, ye will not answer", etc., provokes the question which follows in Luke 22:70, "And they all said, Art thou then the Son of God?" His answer, "Ye say that I am" was neither a

(1) Taylor: Behind the Third Gospel, p. 51.

denial nor an affirmation. His life and teaching only could answer that question.

Taylor writes, "Thus the Lukan story has a unity of its own, which itself accounts for the form of verse 69. It would be artificial in the extreme to hold that this verse has first received its literary form as an editorial modification of Mark 14:62, and then has become the pivot on which another version of the Markan story turns. A similar conclusion should probably be drawn in the case of verse 71:"[1]

> "And they said, What further need have we of witness? for we ourselves have heard from his own mouth."

In Luke the question seems to be asked by all, while in Mark the similar question is by the high priest only:

| Mark 14:63,64. | Matthew 26:65 |
|---|---|
| "And the high priest rent his clothes, and saith, What further need have we of witnesses? Ye have | "Then the high priest rent his garments, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy: what further need have we of |

(1) Taylor: Behind the Third Gospel, p.51.

heard the blasphemy: what think ye? And they all condemned him to be worthy of death."

witnesses? behold, now ye have heard the blasphemy: what think ye? They answered and said, He is worthy of death."

Luke has no reference to blasphemy nor a statement that Jesus was worthy of death.

B. The Civil Trial Before the Roman Procurator.

The Roman governor at Jerusalem at this time was Pontius Pilate--"A typical Roman, stern and practical with all the Roman contempt for superstition, which at that time was synonymous with religion of every variety, and all the hatred of the Jews."[1] Josephus gives us most of the knowledge of Pilate's rule, and records the instance of the standards being carried into Jerusalem by night, and in the resultant action he showed his want of tact, hot temper, and weakness. In spite of the accounts about his actions, he was retained in office ten years by Tiberius.

(1) Smith: In The Days of His Flesh, pp.477,478.

The governor's residence at Jerusalem was called the Praetorium, "The palace which King Herod had built for himself in the days when Judea retained the semblance of freedom."[1] Josephus declares that it stood on the western side of the city and that its magnificence was beyond description. Holtzman writes, "The trial of Jesus seems to have been conducted in the open air in front of the palace of Herod where there was a raised platform adapted for judicial proceedings, called, it would seem, because of its stone floor, Gabbatha."[2] The Fourth Gospel adds that the scrupulous priests would not enter the palace of the heathen governor.

After the hearing before the Sanhedrin, Jesus was brought before Pilate.

Mark 15:1

"And straightway in the morning, the chief priests with the elders and scribes, and the whole council, held a consultation, and bound Jesus, and carried him away, and delivered him up to Pilate."

Matthew 27:1,2.

"Now when the morning was come, all the chief priests and the elders of the people took counsel against Jesus to put him to death: and they bound him, and led him away and delivered him up to Pilate the governor."

(1) Smith: In the Days of His Flesh, p.480.
(2) Holtzman: The Life of Jesus, p.481.

The death sentence had to be confirmed by Pilate before it could be carried out. According to Mark's account, they lost no time in bringing Him before Pilate's tribunal. Matthew adds that they "took counsel against Jesus to put him to death" emphasizing that they really did want to find cause for doing away with Jesus. Luke merely says, "And the whole company of them rose up, and brought him before Pilate." (Luke 23:1)

In this connection Luke assumes that his readers know that Jesus was condemned to death by the Sanhedrin. However, it was necessary that the Roman governor condemn him also in order that he might be executed speedily by the one in power. Plummer writes that"it is almost certain that at this time the Jews were deprived of the right of inflicting capital punishment. They sometimes did inflict it and risked the consequences, as in the case of Stephen; and the Romans sometimes found it expedient to ignore these transgressions. A good deal would depend upon the character of the execution and the humour of the procurator."[1]

In the following verses we find Pilate's questions put to Jesus:

(1) Plummer: I. C. C. Luke, p. 519.

Mark 15:2

"And Pilate asked him, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answering saith unto him, Thou sayest."

Matthew 27:11

"Now Jesus stood before the governor: and the governor asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And Jesus said unto him, Thou sayest."

Here again Matthew's account is parallel to Mark's, placing the first question by Pilate. This seems to be given before any formal accusation of the high priests had been presented. Some think that this is due to Mark's purpose to demonstrate that Jesus was indeed the King of the Jews and that it reflects those early controversies between Jew and Christian which are still more prominent in the Fourth Gospel.

Then too, Luke seems to preserve all the "marks of superior historical accuracy in keeping the logical order of events."[1] The Jewish leaders first prefer a three-fold charge against him.

Luke 23:2

"And they began to accuse him, saying, We found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding

(1) Kent: Life and Teachings of Jesus, p. 286.

to give tribute to Caesar,
and saying that he himself
is Christ, a king."

The first charge is that made against Jesus in the Talmud--that he was a seducer, which is equivalent to the modern term, heretic. This had little weight with the governor who was not interested in the narrow Jewish point of view. The second charge was really a deliberate perversion of the facts, for just a day or two before Jesus had done the very opposite when he paid that tax with Peter at Capernaum. When they had asked Him if it were lawful to pay taxes to Caesar, He had said, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's." Of course, the priests thought that Pilate would be aroused by the charge, since it was his chief duty to see that the Jews paid tribute to Caesar.

The last charge was probably the most important as Pilate's reply indicates. "This then was the accusation decided upon. Jesus asserts that he is the future king of the Jews. Such a claim would amount to high treason against emperor and empire and would beyond question have to be punished with death."[1] Even though

(1) Holtzman: Life of Jesus, p.30,31.

no definite act of treason could be pointed out, it would be rather hazardous for the procurator to set free a man who had been delivered into his hands by his own countrymen as being a traitor against Rome. "More than that, they only required to put an ingenious interpretation upon the solemn entry into Jerusalem and upon the cleansing of the temple: they only required to turn to wise account Jesus' power of attraction as a preacher in order to show him in anything but a harmless light."[1]

Luke records the same question as Mark:

Luke 23:3

"And Pilate asked him saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answered him and said, Thou sayest."

The word 'King' seemed to strike Pilate. Perhaps only because it was pathetically incongruous. Pilate's expression is just what one would expect a Roman official to use. "If Jesus aspired to be a king, it would be a King of the Jews. But when the Sanhedrists mock Him on the cross, they call Him the King of Israel."[2] The pronoun 'thou' which Pilate used is very emphatic, and implies that Jesus' appearance would not indicate

(1) Holtzman: The Life of Jesus, p. 481.
(2) Plummer: I. C. C., p.387.

that He had any kingly claims. Jesus' answer is probably a modified affirmative--non-committal. He merely said, Thou sayest.

Matthew's account is the same as Mark's:

Mark 15:2

"And Pilate asked him, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answering saith unto him, Thou sayest."

Matthew 27:11

"And the governor asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And Jesus said unto him, Thou sayest."

Luke has no parallel to the following verses:

Mark 15:3,4,5.

"And the chief priest accused him of many things. And Pilate again asked him, saying, Answerest thou nothing? behold how many things they accuse thee of. But Jesus no more answered anything; insomuch that Pilate marvelled."

Matthew 27:12-14

"But when he was accused by the chief priests and elders, he answered nothing. Then Pilate saith unto him, Hearest thou not how many things they witness against thee? And he gave him no answer, not even to one word: insomuch that the governor marvelled greatly."

No doubt Pilate's curiosity was aroused by the behavior of the prisoner. His silence before such accusations alone might cause Pilate to wonder. Perhaps there was a visible majesty in the face of a man whose spirit was

to change the history of the world. We see that Pilate was reluctant to condemn. Luke does not record the governor's answer, but gives his ultimatum.

Luke 23:4,5.

> "And Pilate said unto the chief priests and the multitudes, I find no fault in this man. But they were the more urgent, saying, He that stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Judea, and beginning from Galilee even unto this place."

Mark and Matthew have no parallels to either of these verses. This is the first of three times Luke records that Pilate said he found no fault in Jesus. He tries to show that Pilate was not to blame for Jesus' crucifixion and emphasize that the Sanhedrin and the people demanded it. In this verse we see that the Sanhedrin were growing more vehement. They thought He was sowing the seeds of revolution among the people by His teaching. He had begun in Galilee and now had reached Jerusalem.

In the next verse we see that Pilate has found a key-word, Galilee, which seemed to give Pilate a loophole, and he lost no time in making use of it.

Luke 23:6,7.

"But when Pilate heard it, he asked whether the man were a Galilean, And when he knew that he was of Herod's jurisdiction, he sent him unto Herod, who himself also was at Jerusalem in these days."

Luke is the only one who records and the incident following, which is the trial before Herod. Pilate's action in so quickly seizing this opportunity of sending Jesus to Herod, the ruler of Galilee shows how desirous he was of getting rid of the responsibility of settling the case. He saw no reason for condemning Him and yet he could not release the Galilean without incurring the deadly hostility of the rulers.

C. Jesus Before Herod.

Herod Antipas, tetrach of Galilee, was in Jerusalem at this time for the feast. In sending Jesus to Herod, Pilate was doing the governor a courtesy, and no doubt he thought this would establish their friendship again; then, too, he was anxious to extricate himself from a difficult position.

Luke 23:8,9.

> "Now whenHerod saw Jesus, he was exceedingly glad: for he was of a long time desirous to see him, because he had heard concerning him; and he hoped to see some miracle done by him."

According to this account--which is the only one we have--Herod was pleased when the prisoner was brought before him. He had been curious about him a long time. He had wondered about the fame of Jesus in the north and with a skeptic's superstition had conceived the notion that He was the murdered Baptist come back to life. The idea had haunted him. He had wished to see Jesus, and had been minded to kill Him--perhaps at the instigation of the Jewish rulers. But partly

from the reluctance which cowards feel to know their worst and partly from characteristic indolence, he had never procured an interview, preferring rather to remain in uncertainty than have his doubt resolved. Now he unexpectedly found himself face to face with the mysterious personage and discovered to his relief that He was not John the Baptist. Jesus was quite unlike the stern prophet who had lashed his conscience with the stinging scourge of rebuke.

Herod had heard of the miracles performed by Jesus, and no doubt thought this a good time to have a demonstration. It is quite likely that the questions which he asked were concerning His miraculous power. His curiosity was natural and Jesus' silence in the presence of 'that fox' was equally so. Jesus would not gratify Herod in performing a miracle, but maintained silence. "Even though Luke alone recounts this incident, the grounds on which its historicity has been questioned are insufficient."[1]

The next verses describe Jesus' treatment before Herod. We can easily imagine how the members of the Sanhedrin stood by, anxious to torment Him, and accuse Him before Herod. Kent believes that the mockery by Herod was probably due to his failure to

(1) Kent: The Life and Teachings of Jesus, p. 287

elicit any answer from the prisoner.

Luke 23:10,11,12.

"And the chief priests and the scribes stood, vehemently accusing him. And Herod with his soldiers set him at nought, and mocked him, and arraying him in gorgeous apparel sent him back to Pilate. And Herod and Pilate became friends with each other that very day: for before they were at enmity between themselves."

But Herod and his court were not in the mood to take the situation seriously, and so made light of Him and His regal claims by dressing Him in a garment from the king's fine wardrobe and sending Him back to Pilate. No doubt both Pilate and Herod were consoled for their annoyance by bringing their feud to an end, and having their mutual jurisdiction recognized. Their treatment of Jesus gave each the opportunity of a politic and inexpensive generosity. "The circumstantial statement that Pilate's act (in sending Jesus to Herod) established a friendship between himself and Herod con-

firms the reliability of the narrative. It is also significant that the Lucan narrative states that Jesus was mocked and arrayed in royal garments, not by soldiers of Pilate, but by those of Herod."[1]

Pilate saw that his strategem had failed. When Jesus was brought back to him. Then he had to resume the case.

Luke 23:13-16

> "And Pilate called together the chief priests and the rulers and the people, and said unto them, Ye brought unto me this man, as one that perverteth the people: and behold, I, having examined him before you, found no fault in this man touching those things whereof ye accuse him: no, nor yet Herod: for he sent him back unto us: and behold nothing worthy of death hath been done by him. I will therefore chastise him and release him."

Pilate knew that the Jewish leaders were set on killing Jesus, but his Roman reverence for justice revolted from the idea of condemning an innocent man. Luke

(1) Kent: Life and Teachings of Jesus, p.287.

emphasizes in these verses that Pilate considered Jesus innocent and not worthy of death. Yet "he was entirely willing to cruelly scourge him whom he pronounced innocent; but his innate Roman sense of justice made him eager to release Jesus."[1] So we find Pilate making a compromise--consent to a lesser wrong in the hope of averting a greater. It was a poor compromise and it would have met with disapproval had not a 'fresh company of actors appeared on the scene'. Dr.Klausner, a Jewish author, makes an interesting comment on this verse: "Pilate was minded to scourge him only and let him go. Mark and Matthew are ignorant of this episode; nor was it possible for Pilate simply to scourge Jesus and liberate him, since scourging was an essential and inseparable part of the crucifixion sentence."[2]

Matthew and Mark take up the story with the verses about the releasing of a prisoner.

Mark 15:6-8

"Now at the feast he used to release unto them one prisoner, whom they asked of him. And there was one called Barabbas, lying bound with them that

Matthew 27:15,16.

"Now at the feast the governor was wont to release unto the multitude one prisoner, whom they would. And they had then a notable prisoner, called Barabbas.

(1) Kent: Life and Teachings of Jesus, p.287
(2) Klausner: Jesus of Nazareth, p.346.

had made insurrection, men
who in the insurrection had
committed murder. And the
multitude went up and began to
ask him to do as he was wont to
do unto them."

Mark has given more explanatory material here than Matthew and in this way emphasizes the character of Barabbas. Luke merely says,

> "For of necessity he must
> release one unto them at
> the feast." (23:17)

The high priests seemed to know the weakness of Pilate and began to play upon it. No doubt they were the instigators of the demand by the crowd just at this time. Pilate saw another open door for escaping the necessity of condemning Jesus.

Barabbas was a notorious criminal who was lying in prison at the time awaiting execution. He was "one of those brigands who infested the mountains of Judea and rendered the Ascent of Blood so perilous to travellers betwixt Jerusalem and Jericho."[1] It is rather singular that this man's name was Jesus, too.

(1) Smith: In the Days of His Flesh, p. 484.

He was the son of one of the rabbis and known generally as Bar Abba. The people knew well that he was a murderer.

Mark 15: 9, 10.

"And Pilate answered them saying, Will ye that I release unto you the King of the Jews? For he perceived that for envy the chief priests had delivered him up."

Matt. 27:17,18.

"When therefore they were gathered together, Pilate said unto them, Whom will ye that I release unto you? Barabbas or Jesus who is called Christ? For he knew that for envy they had delivered him up."

We see here that Pilate again tried to save Jesus. He apparently appealed to the crowd in his extremity in the hope that some of Jesus' sympathizers would ask for His release.

Mark and Matthew make condemnation greater by saying that he knew that "for envy" the priests had condemned Jesus. Luke, however, omits all reference to the custom of releasing a prisoner and makes the idea of Barabbas originate with the Jews, not with Pilate. Dr. Klausner, the Jewish writer, says, an "important point.....is the fact that the right to free a criminal after condemnation belonged only to the Emperor, and it is, on the whole, most unlikely that in

all his four books Josephus found no opportunity of mentioning such a noteworthy custom as that of liberating a prisoner before the Passover."[1] This would show that Luke's account is the most reliable.

Matthew alone gives the following incident in which Pilate's wife is mentioned:

Matthew 27:19

"And while he was sitting on
the judgment-seat, his wife sent
unto him, saying, Have thou noth-
ing to do with that righteous man;
for I have suffered many things
this day in a dream because of him."

Klausner thinks such a remark from a Roman matron, the wife of the procurator, is very unlikely. Kent speaks as though it might be traditional matter inserted to proclaim Jesus' innocence. However, Smith explains how it is very possible that such an incident did occur, since Pilate's wife would have known of the detachment of soldiers requested for the arrest of Jesus just before she retired. No doubt she had heard

(1) Klausner: Jesus of Nazareth, p. 347.

about Jesus for he had attracted crowds, and she would have inquired about the leader. It is quite possible that she might have heard Him herself.

Both Mark and Matthew blame the priests for the action of the crowd.

Mark 15:11,12.

"But the chief priests stirred up the multitude that he should rather release Barabbas unto them. And Pilate answered and said unto them, What then shall I do unto him whom ye call the King of the Jews? And they cried out, Crucify him."

Matthew 27:20,21.

"Now the chief priests and the elders persuaded the multitudes that they should ask for Barabbas and destroy Jesus. But the governor answered and said unto them, Which of the two will ye that I release unto you? And they said, Barabbas."

Luke's account differs from these, as it does not state Pilate's question.

Luke 23:18,19.

"But they cried out all together, saying, Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas: one who for a certain insurrection made in the city, and for murder, was cast into prison."

For the third time Pilate speaks to them:

| Mark 15:14 | Matthew 27:22,23. |
| --- | --- |
| "And Pilate said unto them, | "Pilate saith unto them, What then shall I do unto Jesus who is called the Christ? They all say, Let him be crucified. And he said, |
| Why, what evil hath he done? But they cried out exceedingly, Crucify him." | Why, what evil hath he done? But they cried out exceedingly, saying, Let him be crucified." |

Again Luke is more sympathetic in his account regarding Pilate mentioning that he desired to release Jesus.

Luke 23:20-23.

"And Pilate spake unto them again, desiring to release Jesus; but they shouted, saying, Crucify, crucify him. And he said unto them a third time, Why, what evil hath this man done? I have found no cause for death in him: I will therefore chastise him and release him. But they were urgent with loud voices, asking that he might be crucified. And their voices prevailed."

The second incident peculiar to the First Gospel is Pilate's demonstration of his innocence.

Matthew 27:24,25.

> "So when Pilate saw that he prevailed nothing, but rather that a tumult was arising, he took water, and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this righteous man: see ye to it."

This may have been so, for if his voice could not be heard, the gesture could be seen. Murry believes"the story is one that we can neither refuse with certainty nor accept with conviction."[1] It is interesting to note the Jewish point of view again: "Washing the hands as a sign that those hands are free of blood is specifically a Jewish custom used in the ceremony of 'the heifer whose neck is to be broken'; and how could a Roman official perform it?"[2] This is the only account of the incident . It is rather surprizing that Matthew would assert this when Mark does not give it, since he follows the Markan account so closely. Neither

(1) Murry: Jesus--Man of Genius, p. 356.
(2) Kent: Life and Teachings of Jesus, p.347.

do Mark nor Luke record, "I am innocent of the blood of this righteous man: see ye to it"; or that the people answered, "His blood be on us, and on our children."

The next verses close the trial narratives:

Mark 15:15

"And Pilate wishing to content the multitude, released unto them Barabbas, and delivered Jesus, when he had scourged him, to be crucified."

Matthew 27:26

"And all the people answered and said, His blood be on us, and on our children. Then released he unto them Barabbas; but Jesus he scourged and delivered to be crucified."

Luke emphasizes that Pilate's action was such because the people demanded it.

Luke 23:24,25.

"And Pilate gave sentence that what they asked for should be done. And he released him that for insurrection and murder had been cast into prison, whom they asked for; but Jesus he delivered up to their will."

From this we see that the cries of the multitude, "Crucify him! Crucify him!" decided the issue. Jesus

was condemned, and Barabbas, the one "that for insurrection and murder had been cast into prison" was released. "His condemnation was the result of the murderous hate of a group of unprincipled men and of a gross disregard of the Roman traditions of justice. In justice, however, it must be said that it was not the act of the Jewish nation as a whole, nor, in all probability, of its best representatives. It is equally important to note that Jesus courted death no more than he feared it. Amidst the passionate scenes of that early morning he alone was serenely confident, assured that God would surely overrule the crimes of men and establish his divine reign."[1]

(1) Kent: Life and Teachings of Jesus, p.288.

## E. Summary.

Luke's account of the trial before Herod has no parallel in Mark. In Luke it is a part of the whole trial by Pilate, and there is a literary unity in verses one to twenty-five. It does not read as though it has just been added from another source, but fits into the complete account from one source. The only possibility of a Markan touch is in verse three of chapter twenty-three.

In the trial before the high priests the percentage of words in common with Mark just amounts to thirty-five, which is a rather small number. This would indicate that Mark is not St. Luke's source. "Moreover, of the thirty-three words which the two narratives have in common, the majority are of little or no importance in their bearing on the question of dependence."[1]

In comparing the Lukan and Markan accounts of the trial before Pilate, one has little doubt that they are of independent origin. Taylor has carefully counted the words in making the comparison: "Of the 372 words of Luke 22:1-25 only 51 (or 13.7 per cent) are common to Mark 12:1-15, and if we omit from the

(1) Taylor: Behind the Third Gospel, p.51.

comparison the Lukan account of the Trial by Herod (verses 6 to 16), the percentage only rises to 26.5. Moreover, of the 51 words common to Luke and Mark, 27 are accounted for by proper names, the verb 'to crucify', and instances of the use of δέ and the definite article. It is interesting to observe that no less than 16 of the words in common occur in a single verse (Luke 23:3)--a fact which raises the question whether this verse may not be a Markan addition."[1] This verse reads: 'And Pilate asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answered him and said Thou sayest.' This is preceded by the three accusations of the priests, and followed by Pilate's assertion, 'I find no fault in this man', with no account of any intervening examination. But perhaps Luke had no information regarding the actual facts of the examination and so he took over the question and answer of this third verse from Mark's Gospel, found in Mark 15:3. This is the only place in the Third Gospel that we find any information regarding the examination of Jesus by Pilate. St. Luke gives more about the attendant circumstances of the trial than about the trial itself. It is possible that he may

(1) Taylor: Behind the Third Gospel, p. 52.

have secured the contents of verse three from oral tradition. But this verse is so very much like Mark 15:2 which is contrary to the rest of the narrative, that it indicates the use of the Second Gospel. This is the only verse in the Lukan narrative that has even a slight claim to Markan parentage.

St. Luke seems to point out more clearly than the other writers that the responsibility for Jesus' fate lay with the chief priests and the scribes. Although the people are mentioned, they play little part in the drama. In Mark 'the multitudes' approach Pilate and remind him of the custom of releasing a prisoner at the feast, although 'the chief priests stirred up the multitude.'[1] In Luke 'they cried out together, Away with this man and release unto us Barabbas.'[2] Mark does not tell us who this Barabbas was, but Luke speaks of his being one who had been cast into prison for murder. He emphasizes the injustice of the sentence by repeating in verse 25 what kind of man was Barabbas, and takes part of the blame from Pilate by inserting 'whom they asked for'--referring to Barabbas.

An important contrast is in the portraits of Pilate. Luke shows his sympathy with the Roman by having Pilate say three times that he found no fault

(1) Mark 15:11 (2) Luke 23:18

in Jesus, thus attempting to save His life and yielding only because he himself would be in danger if he resisted. Mark would show that Pilate is vacillating: 'What then shall I do unto him whom ye call the King of the Jews?'[1] Also 'And Pilate, wishing to content the multitude, released unto them Barabbas, and delivered Jesus, when he had scourged him, to be crucified.'[2] Even in the end Luke seems to want to show that the greater crime lay with the people: 'And Pilate gave sentence that what they asked for should be done.'[3]

(1) Mark 15:12
(2) Mark 15:15
(3) Luke 23:24

## IV. Theories Developed in Recent Source Criticism.

From the preceding discussion it is readily seen that the accounts in the Second and First Gospels are very similar and we can easily accept the well-known belief that St. Matthew obtained most of his material from Mark and the rest from the so-called document, Q. The Lukan picture of the trial is quite different from that of Mark. Although it has been recognized for years that Luke obtained part of his material from the earlier document by Mark and the Q document, it is just in recent years that scholars have written more about the sections found only in Luke. The question arises, did Luke have a single non-Markan source or were there several from which he obtained material? Was this other material used as a main source and Mark used to supplement it or was Mark used as his principal authority and the other material supplementary? That is, has St. Luke inserted non-Markan matter into a Markan framework, or has he introduced Markan extracts into an independent and previously existing Passion narrative of his own? Was Luke the author of this non-Markan material or was it some other writer?

First we shall present the various theories regarding this non-Markan material and then discuss the hypothesis which most satisfactorily answers these questions.

## A. Theory by Dr. J. Vernon Bartlet

Dr. J. Vernon Bartlet in an essay in Oxford Studies[1] rejects the Two Document Hypothesis, for while he believes that Mark was one of the sources used by Luke, he denies the use, and indeed the existence, of a Q. document containing the Sayings of Jesus. He describes his theory as "primarily a sort of 'Two Document' theory of Luke's Gospel alone".[1] He believes that Luke used a second written source "alongside and indeed in preference to Mark"[1], a source which was "parallel with Mark even in sections which at first sight appear dependent on Mark alone".[2] He distinguishes this special source by the symbol S.

Dr. Bartlet has a rather peculiar use of the symbol Q. He seems to mean by Q the general apostolic teaching, defined in particular directions (QM, QMk, QL). QL describes this oral tradition so far as we find it in the Third Gospel--a tradition which includes narrative matter, Logia, and an account of the Passion.

The question arises regarding the relation of this special source S and this oral Q. The Q matter,

(1) Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem, p.316
(2) Ibid, p.323.

it is said, had already taken written shape within S; that is, S and QL had been fused together by the author of S. It is this presumption which explains why Mark and S. have so much in common--basal Q is beneath both. So we find that from the account of John's preaching on in many sections S and Mark follow parallel lines. Even though they are parallel they are none the less separate and distinct. In the language and characteristic ideas of S we have criteria which clearly show a written non-Markan source.

The incorporation of QL with S also explains the freedom with which Mark is ignored and at times traversed in the Passion narrative. Bartlet infers that such a fusion had taken place from the 'natural psychological sequence' visible in the Lukan story of the Passion. It is impossible to isolate the S element in the story, he believes. The S sections "do not form or even suggest a continuous whole such as we should expect to find in a written document or primitive Gospel."[1] There are two alternatives to which we are limited--either the anecdotes peculiar to the Third Evangelist are from his own note-book, or else they reached him already fused with QL. Bartlet endorses the latter view.

(1) Oxford Studies, p. 335.

There is also the same fusion in the matter dealing with events immediately preceding the Passion, and it is found in chapter twenty-four. It is the historical unity of the two elements (QL and S) in the last stage of the ministry of Jesus which leads Bartlet to infer their fusion in a document at St.Luke's disposal.

Evidence is found in the 'Great Interpolation' which appears to throw light upon the identity of the author of S. Once more it is clear that he has fused his special information with the QL tradition. This is seen in the linking of the great Mission Charge with the Dispatch and Return of the Seventy. Accepting these episodes as historical, Bartlet finds the medium of this tradition in someone in specially close touch with the second circle of Jesus' personal followers--the "rest" spoken of in Luke 24:9 cf.33 to whom reference is made in Acts 1:21 in connection with the filling of the gap in the inner circle of the Twelve. Bartlet suggests that such a man would meet in early Jerusalem days someone who had served among the Seventy, and so hear and preserve their special tradition. He points out that the 'links' within the 'Great Insertion' belonged to the source itself and are to be attributed

to the author of S and not to St. Luke. This view is extended so as to include the Lukan parables. The crucial instance is the conjunction of the Scribe's Question regarding the Great Commandment (QL) with the Parable of the Good Samaritan (S). Regarding the origin of this Bartlet decides that we must go behind Luke to his source and since other parables open with the same formula ('A certain man'), it is "natural to infer that they too came to Luke already united with his QL matter in the special source."[1] Thus from chapter three on Bartlet presupposes a written source S, which consists of special traditions, furnished by an eyewitness or an associate of eyewitnesses, which have fused with the common Apostolic tradition the oral deposit which lies behind all the Gospels.

Another question which Dr. Bartlet discusses is the form in which S came to Luke. He says that it hardly needs further arguing to maintain that it lay in a written shape before the Evangelist. We wonder then why it has left no trace in tradition or in Matthew. Bartlet suggests that S never passed into circulation; that it was written for St. Luke in response to his

(1) Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem, p.348.

inquiries, or by St. Luke himself, virtually from his informant's lips. In any case the tradition cannot have reached St. Luke from a number of persons in different circles and at very different dates. "Its homogeneity is too great to be the product of even a single circle of tradition. It bears the impress of a single selective and unifying mind, other/than and prior to that of the Evangelist himself, though one congenial to his own."[1] One of the best statements of Bartlet's theory is: "Thus S was a peculiar form of written memoirs elicited by our Third Evangelist ad hoc, not immediately for the literary purpose to which he finanally put it, but rather as a permanent record of the most authentic tradition to which it had been his lot to obtain access, for use in his work as an evangelist or catechist of the oral Gospel."[2]

Dr. Bartlet suggests that S was probably put in written form while St. Luke was in Caesarea along with St. Paul. Several factors point to Philip, the Evangelist (Acts 21:8f) as St. Luke's chief informant: the intimate and consecutive character of the narrative of the Jerusalem ministry, the traditions touching Jesus and the Samaritans. It is possible that Philip

(1) Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem, p. 350
(2) Ibid, p. 351.

knew some of the Seventy, while he may have heard some of the traditions concerning the earlier Galilean days from St. John. The degree of editorial treatment S underwent when worked into St. Luke's Gospel was probably small, and was due mainly to concern for ordered sequence, especially at the opening of sections and in a lesser degree at their close.

However, one of the main questions in which we are interested is not discussed by Dr. Bartlet, namely, the relative place of Mark and S--which source Luke considered the more valuable.

B. Theory by Dr. W. Sanday

In the introduction of "Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem" Dr. Sanday refers to the work by Dr. Bartlet and describes it as a "strong and detailed essay". He regrets the use of the symbol Q for the "comparatively new entity postulated by Dr. Bartlet".[1] He rather dissents from this part of the theory but welcomes the part relating to St. Luke's special source. He adds that Dr. Bartlet makes a valuable suggestion regarding "S as a 'peculiar form of written mrmoirs elicited by our Third Evangelist ad hoc, not immediately for the

(1) Oxford Studies, pp.xixf.

literary purpose to which he finally put it, but rather as a permanent record of the most authentic tradition to which it had been his lot to obtain access, for use in his own work as an evangelist or catechist of the oral Gospel.'" He also agrees with Dr. Bartlet that St. Luke probably obtained his material during his two years' stay at Caesarea from Philip the Evangelist and his four daughters with perhaps other members of the Caesarean circle. Dr. Bartlet spoke of the special source as being written with which Dr. Sanday agrees.

However, he does not approve of including Q material with S. He mentions P. Feine, who was the first to speak of a special source, J. Weiss and V.H. Stanton as having accepted this inclusion before Dr. Bartlet. He believes this defeats the object for which it was propounded. Of course, the object in view for positing a special source is to explain the material peculiar to Luke and to account for the variations in Matthew and Luke regarding Q matter. Dr. Sanday explains the latter by saying that the two writers did not always follow the same version of Q. He points out that if QL was already a part of S, Luke had no other version. He concludes by saying that he believed St.

Luke was the first to carry out the fusion. He regards favorably the hypothesis of a special source containing material collected by St. Luke, providing the fusion of Q with this material can be viewed as the work of the Evangelist himself. He does not discuss the relation of this part of St. Luke's task to his use of Mark. He recognizes that the theory of a special source as used by St. Luke is not yet established and closes with this paragraph: "But I should like to ask whether it is not possible to rally round the clear and sharply drawn definition of Q as it is presented to us in the earlier essays and so pass on to the closer testing of the supplementary hypothesis of St. Luke's special source."[1]

C. Canon B. H. Streeter

It is rather significant that just ten years after the publication of "Oxford Studies" in which the above paragraph appeared, Canon B. H. Streeter of Oxford brought forth the Proto-Luke Theory in the Hibbert Journal, October, 1921. This was the first statement of this theory. Three years later his book, "The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins" was published in which he enlarged and strengthened the theory.

(1) Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem, p.xxiii.

In the "Four Gospels" Canon Streeter makes several presuppositions in presenting his theory: first, the priority of Mark and Q; second, the view that Mark and Q overlapped, and third, the contention of Sir John Hawkins that no use of Mark is made by the Third Evangelist in Luke 6:20 - 8:3 and Luke 9:51 - 18:14. The two latter passages are uninterrupted blocks of non-Markan material, which contain Q matter and material peculiar to Luke in the proportion of two parts of the former to three of the latter. Some believe that Luke 19:1-27 is a third block containing matter from Q and L, if the Lukan Parable of the Pounds rests upon the same source as the Matthaean Parable of the Talents. Another section is Luke 3:1 - 4:30, which Streeter considers fundamental to his argument. The accounts of John's preaching, the Baptism, and the Temptation are from Q. Then, too, Luke's account of the Resurrection Appearance is from a non-Markan source, while the account of the Last Supper and the Passion (22:14 - 24:12) "looks more like an originally independent version of the story, enriched by certain additions from St. Mark than like a modification of St. Mark's version."[1]

(1) Streeter, B.H.: The Four Gospels, p.212.

Streeter points out that the non-Markan sections form the framework of the Third Gospel, and into this framework are inserted at convenient places extracts from the Gospel of Mark. In the case of Matthew, of course, Mark is the primary source; while QL is the framework of Luke. He contends that this view does not conflict with the Two Document Hypothesis. He wishes to interpolate a stage between Q and the edition of the Third Gospel, which he calls QL or Proto-Luke. It is slightly longer than Mark and less than a third consists of Q matter. St. Luke himself may easily be the author of Proto-Luke, and our present Third Gospel may be his much later and enlarged edition of his own earlier work.

Streeter bases his hypothesis on the following facts: (1) In Luke Markan and Non-Markan materials "are distributed, as it were, in alternate stripes"[1]; (2) the beginning and the end of the Gospel are non-Markan; (3) the non-Markan portions are greater in extent; (4) 3:1 reads "as if originally it stood at the beginning of a book"[1], while the position of the Genealogy (3:23f) is strange; (5) in certain sections St. Luke omits St. Mark's version and gives another version in a completely different context.

(1) Streeter, B.H.: The Four Gospels, p.212

He then cites the following examples for the last point: the Beelzebub Controversy (11:14-23), the Parable of the Mustard Seed (13:18f), the Rejection at Nazareth (4:16-30), the story of the Anointing (7:36f), and the Great Commandment (10:25-8). In these cases St. Luke's version is fuller and more interesting, but in other cases it is not so--the Saying about Salt in 14:34, the Discourse on Divorce in 16:18, and the contrast between the Rulers of the Gentiles and the Son of Man in 22:24-7. From these facts Streeter deduces that Luke's preference is for the source QL as a whole. It is interesting to compare Matthew and Luke in the sections mentioned above. Matthew conflates Mark and Q, whereas Luke either discards Mark altogether, or takes over only a few words. Matthew prefers the context given by Mark. To QL Streeter would add the following: 4:14f, 5:1-11, 6:14-16, 19:37-44, and perhaps 21:18,34-36. Editorial improvements probably are seen in 9:28-30, 20:34-8, 22:3,8.

Canon Streeter lays comparatively little stress upon linguistic evidence in its bearing on the authorship of the non-Markan material. He points out two characteristics of the author of QL--the use of

"Lord" and "the Lord". It is quite important that there is an absence of distinctive linguistic features. It seems to favor the view that originally Q and L were combined by the same author who later united Q and L with Mark to form the present Gospel.

Streeter further suggests that the author of Proto-Luke--"the person who combined together in one document Q and the bulk of the material peculiar to the Third Gospel--was no other than Luke, the companion of Paul."[1] He believes though that this suggestion does not admit of refutation or verification to anything like the same extent as the fact of the existence of QL which is "to a considerable extent capable of verification." One of hismain reasons for affirming the Lukan authorship of QL is the similarity of "tendency" in this document as compared with the Gospel and the Acts, that is "the interest and the point of view evinced in the selection of incidents, the emphasis laid on them, and the general presentation of Christianity and its history which we find in the two works is exactly the same throughout. The special tastes, sympathies, and characteristics of the author are equally conspicuous in the parts of the Gospel derived from

(1) Streeter: B.H.: The Four Gospels, p.218

Proto-Luke, in those which we must attribute to the editor of the whole, in the first part of Acts, in the 'We' sections, and in the final edition of Acts."[1] QL is marked by special knowledge of Herod's court, by its interest in Samaria and Samaritans, by its emphasis upon Christ as the Savior of the world, accepted by Gentiles but rejected by His own people, and by its evident interest in the poor, in women, in sinners and outcasts. Streeter seems to find no difficulty in the fact that the author of Proto-Luke sometimes prefers the more to the less miraculous of two versions of the same story laid before him, for this "is in the widest sense of the term a 'Lucan characteristic'." The atmosphere of QL and the other parts of Lukan works have "a subtle individuality which reflects, not a Church tradition, but a personality of a very exceptional kind."[2]

Streeter suggested in the Hibbert Journal that Proto-Luke was compiled in Caesarea about 60 A.D. partly from an early copy of Q, but mainly from traditional material, some oral, some possibly written. In "The Four Gospels" he puts the date later. He writes, "Luke, during the two years he was at Caesarea in the

(1) Streeter, B.H.: The Four Gospels, p. 219.
(2) Ibid, p. 221.

company of Paul made good use of his opportunities of collecting information and made copious notes. Later on, probably not till after the death of Paul, a copy of Q came his way, and on the basis of this and his own notes he composed Proto-Luke as a Gospel for the use of the Church in the places where he was then living. Still later a copy of Mark came his way, and he then produced the second and enlarged edition of his Gospel that has come down to us."[1]

Streeter contends that Proto-Luke was, and was originally intended as, a complete Gospel, but that most likely it was only meant for a small group of readers, such as we might call private circulation.

He makes high claims regarding the historicity of Proto-Luke. He says that if we are to accept the theory we must recognize the existence of another authority comparable to Mark. The essential point is that Proto-Luke is independent of Mark. Where the two are parallel, Proto-Luke is sometimes superior in historical value, such as in the Trial before Herod; and sometimes it is inferior, as in the details of the Call of Peter. Neither one is infallible, but as historical authorities he believes they should be regarded on the whole as of approximately equal value. In this case

(1) Streeter, B.H. The Four Gospels, p.218

more weight will have to be given in the future to the Third Gospel, and especially to the sections which are peculiar to it.

Streeter's theory seems to be the climax of other previous works. Along with Feine, B and J. Weiss, he holds that a special Lukan source is incorporated in the Third Gospel, but, unlike these scholars, he does not present us with a mere string of fragments. He posits a source in which Lukan material is fused with Q matter (as Feine, Stanton, and Bartlet). But St. Luke's part in the formation of this source is asserted to an extent which transcends that suggested by any of these writers.

In contrast with Bartlet, Streeter assumes the Two Document Hypothesis and modifies it into the Four Document Hypothesis. His theory also does full justice to the implications which Luke makes in the preface of his gospel. Then, too, he does not overlook consideration of the manner in which Mark and the special source have been used in the writing of the Third Gospel.

He includes in his theory the suggestion of Sir John Hawkins regarding the 'travel document' of Luke 9:51 - 18:14, and carries out the method projec-

ted by Dr. Sanday that research should be extended beyond the Two Document Hypothesis into the field of St. Luke's special source. Canon Streeter has built on the foundation already laid by his predecessors and frankly recognizes his debt to them.

Referring to the Proto-Luke theory in a recent address in Boston, this prominent churchman and leader of thought and life, said, "Dr. Taylor's book in many ways strengthens it. I think most people are inclined to accept it."[1]

Briefly summarizing Canon Streeter's theory we would say he believes the non-Markan sections of the Third Gospel form a complete gospel which St. Luke uses as a framework into which parts from the Second Gospel have been woven. He chooses to call this non-Markan material Proto-Luke, because the author was St. Luke, the author of the Third Gospel.

He believes it is an authority comparable to the gospel of Mark and of approximately equal value. He claims that Proto-Luke is superior in historical value, such as in the trial before Herod. As we have seen, Luke is the only writer who gives the examination by Herod.

(1) Address in King's Chapel, Boston, Mar.27,1928.

Applying Streeter's conclusions directly in their bearing on the problem of Lukan departures and the Lukan origins of the trial account, we believe that Proto-Luke answers the questions raised and that Luke's account of the trial can be considered authoritative. Luke's use of this source would show that he considered it more valuable than Mark and upon that source he based his gospel.

Canon Streeter has made a great contribution to Synoptic Criticism and his work is the basis for the valuable book by Dr. Taylor on the Proto-Luke Hypothesis.

## D. Alfred M. Perry

In his book, "The Sources of Luke's Passion-Narrative", Alfred M. Perry presents a very detailed study of our problem under consideration. He builds upon the foundations laid by Hawkins, Burkitt and Stanton. After a very thorough examination of the Passion narrative, he concludes that the Evangelist has taken it from a non-Markan source which he designates as the Jerusalem source, J. He writes, "It has been shown that this source was a Greek document, probably a trans-

lation from the Aramaic, that its origin is probably to be fixed in the Christian community at Jerusalem, about the year, 45 A.D., and that its author was probably a disciple of Jesus and eyewitness of the events he describes."[1] He substitues for Q two documents. One is embodied in the Lukan account of the Galilean Ministry, designated G, and the other in the Perean section, termed P. Since the Passion narrative is from the source he terms J, his theory of G and P make little difference in this particular discussion.

Perry denies the Lukan authorship of J and places the date very early. He puts much reliance on the vocabulary and style of J and dwells greatly on the descriptive touches, the redundancies and exact details in J. He writes, "The materials ascribed to J on the grounds of external diversity from the Passion-narrative of the Second Gospel are shown to be independent of the rest of the sources of the Third Gospel and to possess a unity of their own."[2] Their vocabulary is independent, possessing a number of specially characteristic words, having its own choice of synonyms, and using but rarely words which are characteristic of the Lukan writings as a whole. They show individuality

(1) Perry, A. M.: The Sources of Luke's Passion Nar.
(2) Ibid, p. 105. /p.106.

of style with characteristic forms in the rhetoric and syntax and with a stronger Semitic coloring of the language than has the Markan narrative. And in the matter of thought and viewpoint, Perry claims, they stand apart from the rest of the Third Gospel. However, if this is true, the Evangelist was only a compiler.

Perry speaks of J as a rather fixed entity. He writes, "The diversity of thought is also marked. The interest of J in Jesus centers about hisdeath; but G and P are concerned chiefly with his teaching and saving activities, and hardly make mention of the event which is central for J."[1] He speaks of the destruction of Jerusalem not appearing in G or P and that Matthew makes no use of the J source. He concludes by saying that "J cannot have been connected with either the Galilean or the Perean document."[2]

The central theme of his book, however, is the non-Markan character of J and its historical value. In speaking of the J narratives he says that a presumption in their favor is established by the fact that Luke chose to follow these materials rather than the Markan account, especially if any weight is to be at-

(1) Perry, A.M.: TheSources of Luke's Passion-Narrative, /p.100
(2) Ibid, p.101.

tached to either the good sense or the purpose of accurate investigation which he has professed (Luke 1:3).

He then speaks of the author of J as one who possessed the insight and breadth of view which are essential to accurate writing, and had a sympathetic understanding "which enabled him to write with a certain degree of objectivity and to criticize the traditions presented to him."[1] He does not agree with Harnack who attributes this material and the remainder of Luke's peculiar materials to Philip and his four daughters who "characterizes the whole as 'altogether wanting in sobermindedness and credibility.'" He believes the historic value of J must be rated high, and it would be of prime importance if the author were an eyewitness.

Canon Streeter realizes the worth of Perry's painstaking study and refers to it as "The most thorough attempt I know to unravel Luke's sources."[2] A little earlier in speaking of the Passion narrative, he writes, "The most elaborate attempt to work it out in detail is perhaps that of the American scholar, A. M. Perry."[3] Canon Streeter told the writer that "Proto-Luke does not conflict with Perry but rather extends beyond it."[4]

(1) Perry, A.M.: The Sources of Luke's Passion Nar.p.100
(2) Streeter, B.H.: The Four Gospels, p. 217n.
(3) Ibid, p. 203.
(4) King's Chapel, Boston, March 27, 1928.

## E. Dr. Burton Scott Easton

In his recent commentary, "The Gospel According to St.Luke", Dr. Easton discusses Mark and Q as sources for the Third Gospel and then turns to the large portion of the gospel which remains. He adopts "the hypothesis, defended most notably by Streeter and Weiss which assigns the great bulk of this material to a third written source, L."[1]

Easton brings out that L's style has a strong LXX coloring, and is marked by frequent Semitisms. He believes the outlook is intensely Judaistic, to the point of ignoring Gentile Christianity altogether. The church to which L's author belonged felt itself to be simply the true Israel, in contrast to the unbelieving Jews around it. There is a bitter hatred for the leaders of these unbelievers (scribes, Pharisees, and the well-to-do classes generally), but toward the 'people' the attitude is much more sympathetic. This corresponds with the situation in Palestine at any time (say) 40 A.D. when the church was in extreme poverty and could make converts only from among the poor. The atmosphere is Judean, rather than Galilean, with some interest in Samaria. There was persecution, but persecution limited to economic oppression and social ostracism; real mar-

(1) Easton, B. S.: The Gospel According to St.Luke, p. xxiii.

tyrdom hardly existed. The hope of this church was the eschatological program of the earliest Christianity, with special emphasis on its anti-zelotic features and with no illusions as to the inviolability of Jerusalem."[1]

Easton is in favor of treating Q and L as separate documents in Luke's hands. He says that Matthew and Luke appear to have used the same text of Mark, but a document such as Q might be more susceptible of modification. Regarding the historic value of L, he believes it is hard to appraise it in any single formula. There is much material of high worth especially in the Passion narrative.

He writes, "The general tone of Luke points to a period when the "rich" were enjoying undisturbed power rather than a time when the visitation of the Roman conquest had fallen on them."[2] He would place the date between 55 and 65 A. D.

Dr. Easton speaks of L as a Greek document and so would seek its author among the "Hellenists", a class that existed from the earliest days of the church. He writes, "Certain scholars, notably Harnack, have suggested Philip the Evangelist, with whom the writer of the "We" sections of Acts came into contact

(1) Easton, B.S.: TheGospel According to St. Luke,
(2) Ibid, p. xxiii. /pp. xxii, xxiii

in Caesarea (Acts 21:8f). This is, of course, little more than a guess, but it is not unplausible."[1] He does not suggest Luke as the possible author of this material, although in the beginning of his discussion of L he writes that his commentary has adopted the hypothesis defended by B. Weiss and Streeter, and Streeter named Luke as the author.

Although Dr. Easton makes quite a study of this special source showing its peculiar vocabulary, the distribution of certain words, L's style, and speaks of its historic value and literary beauty, he does not say which source was Luke's preference. It seems that this is one of the main questions we wish to consider--whether the gospel of Mark was the framework into which Luke inserted non-Markan material when he wrote his gospel, or if he regarded Mark as supplementary material and the other as the more reliable source.

F. Dr. Vincent Taylor.

The same year in which Dr. Easton's commentary was published Dr. Vincent Taylor brought forth an excellent book, "Behind the Third Gospel". Just as

(1) Easton, B.S.: The Gospel According to St.Luke, p.xxviii.

Canon Streeter built on previous foundations suggested by Bartlet and Sanday and brought forth the Proto-Luke Hypothesis, Dr. Taylor has followed Streeter, and produced his book on Proto-Luke. However, Streeter was working on an expanded discussion of his hypothesis and it was published as a chapter in his book, "The Four Gospels" just before Dr. Taylor's book was ready for the press.

While necessarily recapitulating many of Canon Streeter's arguments, he goes into greater detail, adding new points and by verbal statistics and a closer analysis of the literary phenomena increases the weight of the arguments on which he relied.

Dr. Taylor closely compares the three gospels counting the words that are common to each. In the earlier part of this paper we referred to his conclusions regarding the trial narratives. From this comparison he reaches the conclusion that there is one continuous non-Markan source because of the continuity of the references, the cross-references between individual narratives, and the portraiture of Christ. He also concludes that the source is documentary and not oral.

He makes a very detailed study of St. Luke's use

of his Markan source, showing the sections from Mark found in the Third gospel, the passages omitted--the 'Markan Omissions'--and a list of other Markan passages, mainly narratives, in respect of which preference has been given to non-Markan versions. "There are cases in which St. Luke has preferred to take a parallel version from a non-Markan source." These include The Call of the First Disciples, The Visit to Nazareth and The Approach into Jerusalem and Departure to Bethany, and possibly others. Then there are cases in which the Markan story is omitted because of a similar, but not necessarily a parallel, non-Markan story.

He has a chapter on St. Luke's Use of Q in which he classifies and examines the existing non-Markan sections in the Third Gospel. In conclusion he makes the following inferences: (a) "In Luke an attempt is clearly manifest to impose on Q a narrative form. (b) In the sections where Q is used, the Q matter usually forms the foundation of the structure. (c) In Luke, Q is always used in connexion with non-Markan matter; it is never fused with material derived from Mark, and (d) The broad similarity of plan and construction in the four main sections:[1] Luke 3:1 - 4:30, 6:12 - 8:3, 9:51 - 18:14, and 19:1-28.

(1) Taylor, V.: Behind the Third Gospel, p.161.

These facts must be explained if Mark is St. Luke's basal source, the foundation and framework of his Gospel. The question rises why Mark and Q are segregated and why the latter is always fused with non-Markan material.

In Luke the Q source does not lie bare, but it is supplemented with non-Markan material. Taylor states that at least three stages lie behind the Third Gospel: (1) The Q document, possibly to some extent already enlarged; (2) An expanded narrative version of Q; (3) the Third Gospel, as we have it now, furnished with material derived from Mark. He then proceeds to answer the questions regarding the continuity of a main non-Markan source and discusses the non-Markan sections in Luke which appear to stand apart from everything else in the gospel. These are the birth and infancy narratives, the preface to the gospel, and the sections in the eschatological discourse, found in Luke 21:12-19 and 20-36 less the Markan insertions.

He points out the 'gap' existing between the Passion narrative and the rest of St. Luke's non-Markan material. The Lukan Passion Narrative opens with the account of the Last Supper. In the Third

Gospel as we have it now the Markan story of the Preparations for the Passover precede the narrative (Luke 22:7-13). When this incident is left aside as a later addition to the Lukan source, the Passion narrative begins abruptly with the words, "And when the hour was come, he sat down and the apostles with him." (22:14). It does not seem possible to establish a connection between the last non-Markan passage which is the reference to the teaching activity of Jesus in Jerusalem and the undefined 'hour' found in Luke 22:14. Although this 'gap' creates difficulties, Taylor does not believe that St. Luke's Passion and Resurrection narrative rests on a source that is separate and distinct from anything else in the gospel, but that Q was expanded with the purpose of introducing the Passion narrative, in such a way as to form one continuous source.

Taylor writes, "The Proto-Luke Hypothesis posits a continuous non-Markan source, consisting mainly of Q matter and material peculiar to Luke, as the foundation and framework of the Third Gospel. This document represents the first stage in the composition of Luke, although, at the time when it was constructed,

no thought of the larger work was in the writer's mind. At that time, his purpose was to give to the source commonly known as Q a narrative form, by adding to it stories and parables which by his own research he had gathered, and in particular an account of the Passion and Resurrection of Christ."[1] He says that it may not have been Luke's object to publish it immediately, but that the document was used later in constructing a larger work, the Third Gospel. "Proto-Luke, for so we may call this document, was the main source used in compiling the Gospel. Into it large extracts from Mark have been inserted, and the whole has been preceded by the Birth and Infancy narratives, and the Preface to the Gospel (i.1-4)"[2] This theory completely reverses the commonly accepted account of the Third Gospel which is that the gospel of Mark has been the framework into which Luke has inserted matter from Q and his special material at two points in the Markan story--the so-called Lesser and Greater Interpolations, Luke 6:20 - 8:3 and Luke 9:51 - 18:14. Regarding the Passion narrative, Taylor writes, "For his Passion narrative, the Third Evangelist has edited a non-Markan source, using Mk. as a supplementary authority. This conclusion raises a pre-

(1) Taylor, V.: Behind the Third Gospel, p.182.
(2) Ibid, p.182.

sumption that much the same is true of the earlier part of the Gospel. Detailed study confirms this presumption."[1]

Dr. Taylor's study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis is a real contribution to New Testament source criticism. His work is very intensive; he has left no phase of the subject untouched. We shall now proceed with a discussion of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis and the reasons for accepting it as the solution of the problem of the non-Markan material found in the Third Gospel.

(1) Taylor, V.: Behind the Third Gospel, p.201.

## V. The Proto-Luke Hypothesis.

### A. Reasons for the Hypothesis.

The Proto-Luke theory, as we have seen, completely reverses the commonly accepted theory of the composition of the Third Gospel, according to which the framework is supplied by Mark and material from Q and the non-Markan matter inserted into this foundation by the Evangelist. If Streeter and Taylor are right, Proto-Luke must be regarded as an authority comparable to Mark and independent of Mark.

1. Use of Markan Source

Let us first consider the way in which St. Luke has used his Markan source. We find there are alternate stripes of Markan and non-Markan material in the Third Gospel. The belts of Markan matter are Luke 4:31-44, 5:12 - 6:11, 8:4 - 9:50, 18:15-43, 20:1-21:11 and 22:1-13. Besides these there are two separate narratives which stand alone--the Obtaining of the Colt (Lk.19:29-36) and the Cleansing of the Temple (Lk. 19:45f.) Luke 4:31-44 deals with the events of twenty-four hours in the life of Jesus and consists for the most part of material relating to the healing ministry of Jesus in Galilee. Luke 5:12 - 6:11 is material belonging to

the Galilean ministry including three healing miracles, two narratives relating to the Sabbath controversy and a few verses containing sayings of Jesus. However, these are taken from one passage, Mark 1:21 - 3:6. This is a sign that it is the substance rather than the frame of Mark which is being utilized. In the Ministry of the Baptist, the Temptation of Jesus, the Baptism and the Departure to Galilee, Mark is passed by.

Parallels to all contained in Mark 3:7-30 are found in the non-Markan parts of Luke. The next block of Markan material is taken from Mark 3:31 - 4:25 found in Luke 8:4-21. With the exception of one narrative (The Visit of the Mother and Brethren of Jesus) the section consists entirely of parabolic matter. The transfer of the Visit to the end suggests that once more it is the character of the material used rather than any development in the course of events which distinguishes this section.

The next Markan stripe (Mark 4:35 - 6:44) is characterized by unity of subject matter, consisting of miraculous events. St. Luke has omitted but two narratives from this section (the Visit of Jesus to Nazareth and the story of the Daughter of Herodias). The effect of these omissions gives greater unity to the Markan section as it appears in L.

In Luke 9:18-50 we find another Markan block (Mark 8:27 - 9:40). In the passage there is a march of events. Luke gives this section quite a different position than Mark does. In Mark it is little more than a single chapter from the Passion section while in the Third Gospel it is followed by the so-called 'Greater Interpolation' (Lk. 9:51 - 18:14). There are more than eight chapters intervening before the point at which the Markan Passion opens (Mk.9 - 16). In dealing with Mark 8:27 - 9:40 St. Luke has ignored the indications in Mark which point to movements outside Galilee. He omits reference to Caesarea Philippi and also Mark 9:30, 'And they went forth from thence and passed through Galilee'. So in Luke, the parallel section is a Galilean section and it is natural to infer that the Markan section is taken over because of its interesting and important context. This would indicate that Mark was used as a secondary source and not as a foundation. The other Markan sections used are: Mark 10:35-45, Mark 11:15-17, 11:27 - 13:8, and Mark 14:1-16. In these sections it seems that St. Luke has selected and arranged the material for interest and homogeneity.

From this last section the author omits the Anointing at Bethany found in Mark 14:3-9. The three parts--the Priests' plot, the Treachery of Judas and Preparations for the Passover--form an introduction to the Lukan account of the Passion narrative. We see that nearly half of Mark's opening chapter is excised by Luke, and the end (Mark 14:17 - 16:8) is practically neglected. This treatment by Luke of the Markan source shows that he is, as Taylor puts it, 'an excavator, a treasure-seeker.' Surely if he considered Mark a primary source he would not have made so very many changes. He seems to be searching for material, rather than for a foundation upon which to build his structure. Mark is a valuable source in the hands of St. Luke, but it is a secondary one.

**2. The Passion Narrative.** The Lukan Passion narrative presents a difficulty if we should consider Mark a primary source. In both Gospels this narrative forms the climax. In Mark it forms at least one-third of the Gospel and is the goal toward which the whole story moves. St. Matthew follows Mark more closely as the story moves on, and the Passion story is but a revision of Mark's account.

However, St. Luke practically deserts Mark at the climax where it seems he would follow it more closely, if it were his principal source. Instead of that he has just inserted Markan extracts into a narrative from another source. If St. Luke considered Mark his primary source, why should he abandon it just at its climax?

3. Markan Omissions. Let us now consider the Markan material which St.Luke omits. We find there are cases in which he has taken a parallel version from a non-Markan source such as The Call of the First Disciples, the Visit to Nazareth, the Approach to Jerusalem, and probably The Departure to Galilee, the Healing by the Seaside, The Appointment of the Twelve, and the Priests' Plot after the Cleansing. Then too, there are cases in which the Markan story is omitted because of a similar non-Markan section. These are, The Teaching about True Greatness, the Request of James and John, the Cursing of the Fig Tree, the Withering of the Fig Tree, and the Anointing at Bethany. A great block of material has been omitted, called the 'Great Omission', Mark 6: 45 - 8:26. There are differences of opinion regarding the reason for this omission. Sir John Hawkins dismisses the view that the entire passage is a later insertion from Mark in consequence of the linguistic

evidence. He believes this is"sufficient to establish a moral certainty that this part of Mark was drawn up by the same author or editor as the rest of the Gospel. And from this surely there results a very strong probability that it formed part of the Marcan document which was available for Luke as well as for Matthew."[1] Canon Streeter[2] suggests that St. Luke used a mutilated copy of Mark in which this passage was lacking. Taylor does not believe a mutilation can be proved, nor does he believe it better than the theory of intentional omission. Hawkins finds the cause of the omission in a combination of the two hypotheses of accident and intention. If St. Luke had regarded Mark as a primary source he surely would not have omitted such a long passage.

4. Use of Q Material

In this connection we must also consider St. Luke's use of Q. There are four sections in which Q material appear: Luke 3:1 - 4:30, Lk. 6:12 - 8:3, Lk. 9:50 - 18:14 and Lk. 19:1-28. Taylor writes, "Outside these passages nothing in Lk. has been taken from Q, with the possible exception of the saying in Lk.22:30b ('And ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel'.)"[3] From his display of Q matter we can see that the Q material constitutes a framework into which

(1) Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem,p.66.
(2) Streeter, B.H.: The Four Gospels, p. 176.
(3) Taylor, V.: Behind the Third Gospel, p.144.

St. Luke has woven non-Markan matter in such a way as to secure a continuous narrative. Each passage shows the manner in which the Lukan matter is woven together. Taylor says that Q is the backbone wherever it can be used as such, and into it Lukan matter is fitted. The relationship is reversed only as the Q material becomes exhausted. We find that Q is fused with non-Markan matter, furnished with editorial passages and stands apart from the Markan sections of the Gospel.

B. Proto-Luke a Complete Gospel.

1. Opinions Regarding non-Markan matter

We shall now turn to the question of continuity of the non-Markan material. As we have seen, Taylor posits a continuous non-Markan source, but Bartlet writes, "If we isolate such S sections, they do not form or even suggest a continuous whole such as we should expect to find in a written document or primitive Gospel."[1] He believes that even if the material up to the Passion narrative had been a continuous whole, the material suggests that in the latter part the author is speaking as an eyewitness and so reproduces the local form of the current Apostolic tradition (OL) in its real historic setting. Dr. Sanday agrees with

(1) Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem, p. 335.

Bartlet except regarding the fusion of the Q material. Perry, in his study of the Passion Narrative, says that in the order of sections, in similarity of language, and in the introduction of new materials Luke departs widely from his former agreement with his Markan source. After he examined the materials in detail he concluded that the various sections of the Passion narrative form a connected account. He further states that the materials of this special source possess a unity of their own and are shown to be independent of the rest of the sources of the Third Gospel.

However, Canon Streeter writes in this connection: "The frequency of his (Luke's) preference and especially the fact that it extends to matters of order, is explicable only if the non-Markan material formed a complete Gospel so considerable as to seem worthy not only of being compared with, but even of being preferred to, Mark".[1] He also speaks of Luke's use of twice as much material from Proto-Luke as xxx xxxx from Mark, which would indicate that he regarded this as his special source. He emphasizes that Proto-Luke was, and was originally intended as, a complete Gospel.

(1) Streeter, B.H.: The Four Gospels, p. 212.

2: Why a Single Source.

The question now arises, which of these authors is correct regarding this non-Markan source? Was this material which we call Proto-Luke a complete gospel , or was the Passion narrative from another source? There are several reasons for believing in a single source.

a. We find that the several parts of the non-Markan material can be brought together and the whole reads as one gospel. There is unity throughout. The first section closes with the account of a Galilean mission; the second relates to the Call of Simon and the third opens with the story of the Appointment of the Twelve. This section ends with an account of the preaching tour, and the following section is a long journey narrative, closing with the parable about a publican. Then the journey to Jerusalem is completed, and the rest gives subsequent activities of Jesus in Jerusalem. These read like one continuous story.

b. In the four non-Markan sections mentioned on page 100 the Q element is fundamental. There is good reason to suppose that these sections reproduce with considerable accuracy the original order of Q. Q is expanded and thrown into narrative form. This would

be strange if we were dealing with fragments instead of one source.

c. Then, too, the fact that practically all of the non-Markan material outside of the Passion and Resurrection narratives appear in these four sections would show the same thing. There are just three other short non-Markan passages: Luke 5:1-11, 19:37-44, and 19:47,48. In the same way that St. Luke combined new material with Q and still retained the order of that source, he might have treated Mark. But since he did not do this, one would think that the combination of Lukan and Q matter in the non-Markan sections was done independently of Mark and in the same source.

d. Another argument for the single non-Markan source is that these seven passages read as a coherent narrative. Although the story is brief, this is explained if the 'source' is a version of Q converted into narrative form.

e. Then, too, as Taylor shows[1] the deficiences of this source, that is, the points at which it would seem it should be supplemented, are those which are supplied by the Markan sections. If the Markan passages are correctly described as 'Insertions', the

(1) Taylor, V.: Behind the Third Gospel, p.185f.

view is held that the non-Markan sections are parts of a continuous source.

f. We cannot agree with Bartlet and Perry that the Passion narrative is from a different source than the preceding non-Markan sections. It may be that the Passion narrative was constructed separately and that Q was expanded with the idea of being followed by the Passion narrative, forming one continuous source. The reasons for believing this to be so are: first, the Passion narrative is a fragment, with its beginning lost. It does not seem possible that a source would begin with an account of the Last Supper, nor that the source would be limited to just this narrative. Second, if scholars are right in counting the seven sections as non-Markan, the Passion narrative seems a natural sequel to their story; also the Priests' Plot would naturally be followed by the Passion narrative. Third, the contents of the non-Markan sections lead up to the Passion narrative, and it is the natural ending.

Taylor explains the 'gap' preceding the Passion narrative by saying that St. Luke was influenced by Mark's Gospel and underwent a change of mind, the effects of which are seen in Luke 22:14-19a. He said,

"If our theory regarding the Lukan account of the Supper is sound, we have the strongest possible reason to suppose that Lk.22:1-13 has not only been added to the Passion narrative, but has actually replaced the original introduction to that story."[1]

g. The links between the non-Markan sections, the disposition of Q material, and of material peculiar to Luke, the cross-references and connecting links between the Passion narrative and the remainder, the explanation of the 'gap' at the beginning of the Passion narrative all show that the seven sections of non-Markan material are portions of a single source, which we call Proto-Luke.

(1) Taylor, V.: Behind the Third Gospel, p.179.

## VI. Summary.

In the triple parallel accounts of the trial of Jesus we saw that there were numerous expansions, transpositions or abbreviations of minor details in addition to the more obvious differences. The trial by the Jewish authorities is removed from the night to the morning following and to the trial by Pilate, of which a much fuller account is given, is added the examination of Jesus by Herod. These divergences are so great that it is inconceivable that St. Luke did not have some other authority for the correction of the Markan account.

In the next section we compared the accounts verse by verse pointing out the departures. By counting the words in common in the narratives we found there was little doubt that Luke obtained material from some source other than Mark and Q.

In studying the theories propounded by various scholars we found that they agree that the material peculiar to Luke'sGospel must be from another source. However, they do not agree in the extent of that source, that is, whether it comprised all the sections, including the Passion narrative. Nor do they agree on which

source was St. Luke's principal authority--the one he considered the most authentic.

In the discussion of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis we showed how St. Luke used his Markan source, what sections he had omitted in the Second Gospel, how he used the Q material and the analogy presented by the Passion narrative. All these show that St. Luke did not regard the Gospel of Mark as his principal authority, but rather used his special source as the framework into which he wove the Markan material.

We further showed that this special source, Proto-Luke, was a complete gospel and included the Passion narrative. Previous to the Proto-Luke theory, discussions of the historical evidence for the life of Christ was based on Mark and Q, and since Q is confined to sayings, Mark alone could be considered the authority. However, Proto-Luke as the framework of the Third Gospel must now be considered an authority at least equivalent to Mark, and Luke's account of the trial authoritative.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY


Bartlet, J. Vernon: Essay in Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem, by Sanday.

Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1911.

Bosworth, Edward I.: Life and Teachings of Jesus

Macmillan Company, New York, 1924.

Easton, Burton Scott: The Gospel According to St.Luke

Scribners' Sons, New York, 1926.

Gilbert, George H.: Student's Life of Jesus

Macmillan Company, New York, 1900.

Hastings, J.: Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels,I,II.

Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1906.

Holtzman, Oscar: The Life of Jesus

Adams and Chas. Black, London, 1904.

Kent, Charles Foster: Life and Teachings of Jesus

Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1913.

Klausner, Joseph: Jesus of Nazareth
(Translated from original Hebrew by Herbert Danby of Jerusalem)
Macmillan Company, New York, 1926.

Finney, Ross L.: Huck's Synopsis of First Three Gospels

Methodist Book Concern, New York, 1915.

Murry, J.Middleton: Jesus--Man of Genius

Harper and Brothers, New York, 1926

Perry, Alfred Morris ; The Sources of Luke's Passion Narrative.

University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1920.

Plummer, Alfred: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke.

Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1896.

Sanday, W. et al: Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem

Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1911

Plummer, Alfred: An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S.Matthew

Robert Scott Company, London, 1915.

Smith: In the Days of His Flesh

A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 1905

Streeter, Burnett H.: The Four Gospels

Macmillan Company, New York, 1925

Taylor, Vincent: Behind the Third Gospel

Claredon Press, Oxford, 1926.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02487 0752

NOT TO BE TAKEN
FROM THE LIBRARY